UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,432	04/07/2004	Marko Torvinen	915-014.005	7172

4955 7590 08/16/2007

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
TANK, ANDREW L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/820,432	TORVINEN, MARKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Tank	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment of May 14, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 25, 28, 29, and 30-45 and their corresponding dependent claims. Claims 1-45 have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. Applicant's amendment of claims 29-42 overcomes the examiner's non-statutory subject matter rejection of March 23, 2007. The examiner withdraws his previous rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8-19, 22-33, and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,674,453 (**Schilit et al.**) in view of "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 10 Minutes", by Jill T. Freeze, published by Sams Publishing 1999 (**Freeze**).

- Claims 1, 15 and 29: **Schilit et al.** disclose a method for document link presentation and selection in an electronic device, the method comprising:

- opening a first hypertext page comprising at least one separate link area in said electronic device (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 9-16);
- **Schilit et al.** further discloses that link areas may contain a plurality of links (Schilit Fig. 5A navigation Menu has multiple links, Fig. 5B shows the parsed menu reflecting the links), but **Schilit et al.** do not disclose the displaying of at least part of said first hypertext page in a movable view window in the area of said first hypertext page, nor the determining of a link area comprising a plurality of links nearest to a first point on said view window. However, **Freeze** discloses that when web pages overflow a screen's boundaries in Microsoft Internet Explorer 5™ that one can scroll both vertically and horizontally until the desired elements appear onscreen (**Freeze** page 32 "See the Whole Picture") as well as moving a mouse pointer over a link will determine a URL for the link (**Freeze** page 32 "Where am I going?"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to allow a user to navigate a larger hypertext document using a moveable view window as well as using a cursor to determine links. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better view a preformatted larger webpage without sacrificing the format for a smaller screen and to allow the user greater freedom in their selection of links.
- **Schilit et al.** further disclose forming a link list comprising links associated w/ said link area (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 35-61);
- allowing a user to select a first link in the list (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 41-42); and

- opening a second hypertext page indicated by said first link in said electronic device (**Schilit et al.** col 8 lines 25-34).

- Claims 2, 16 and 30: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose the method comprising:
  - activating said link list in response to a user interface event (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 41-49); and
  - presenting said link list in a separate window (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 41-49).
- Claims 3, 17 and 31: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15, and 29 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose the method comprising:
  - determining a logical order for at least two links in said link list based on a spatial order of the link descriptions on said first hypertext page (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 51-53);
  - assigning at least two keys in said electronic device for said at least two links based on said logical order (**Schilit et al.** Figure 5B); and
  - communicating said selection of said first link by pressing one of said at least two keys (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 40-52).
- Claims 4, 18 and 32: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 3, 17 and 31 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose the method wherein said at least two keys are function keys (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 24-26 "keypad").
- Claims 5, 19 and 33: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 3, 17 and 31 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose the method wherein said at least two keys are number keys (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 24-26 "keypad").

- Claims 8, 22 and 36: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, and **Schilit et al.** further discloses the method wherein said link area is a separate structural element in the source code for said hypertext page (**Schilit et al.** col 5 lines 13-15 "parsed").
- Claims 9, 23 and 37: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claim 1, 15 and 29 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose that the electronic device is a mobile terminal (**Schilit et al.** Abstract lines 3-5). **Schilit et al.** do not disclose that said hypertext page is larger than the display on said electronic device. However, **Freeze** discloses that when web pages overflow a screen's boundaries in Microsoft Internet Explorer 5™ that one can scroll both vertically and horizontally until the desired elements appear onscreen (**Freeze** page 32 "See the Whole Picture"). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made for a webpage to be larger than the display on the mobile terminal. One would have been motivated to include this as mobile devices tend to have small resolution screens and most web pages appear larger than them.
- Claims 10, 24 and 38: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 9, 23 and 37 above, and **Schilit et al.** further disclose that said hypertext page is specified using hypertext markup language (HTML) or extensible hypertext markup language (XHTML) (**Schilit et al.** col 2 lines 25-34 and col 5 lines 9-11).
- Claims 11, 25 and 39: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, but do not specifically disclose the method wherein said view window is moved in the area of said hypertext page using a pointer device. However, **Freeze** shows clicking and dragging to scroll to the desired elements (**Freeze** page 32 "See the Whole Picture").

Further, applicant shows the use of pointer devices such as finger-operated joysticks, mini-trackballs, flat sliding buttons, and the standard mouse is known in the related art (Present Specification page 3 lines 21-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to allow a user to use a pointing device, such as a joystick, to navigate the view window. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide the user with a large number of input choices.

- Claims 12, 26 and 40: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, but do not specifically disclose the method wherein said electronic device is a SYMBIAN™ operating system device. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that in order for an electronic device to browse the Internet, the device would have to have some sort of existing software backbone in place, i.e. an operating system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to have the electronic device the method is acting on to come installed with an operating system capable of accessing the internet such as WINDOWS 95™, WINDOWS 98™, WINDOWS XP™, SYMBIAN™, LINUX, X-WINDOWS™, etc. One would have been motivated to do this in order to have the method act on a preexisting operating system instead of spending resources in order to develop one's own.
- Claims 13, 27 and 41: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, but do not specifically disclose the method wherein said electronic device is a SYMBIAN™ operating system device. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that in order for an electronic device to browse

the Internet, the device would have to have some sort of existing software backbone in place, i.e. an operating system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to have the electronic device the method is acting on to come installed with an operating system capable of accessing the internet such as WINDOWS 95™, WINDOWS 98™, WINDOWS XP™, SYMBIAN™, LINUX, X-WINDOWS™, etc. One would have been motivated to do this in order to have the method act on a preexisting operating system instead of spending resources in order to develop one's own.

- Claims 14, 28 and 42: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, but do not specifically disclose the method wherein said electronic device is a GPRS or a UMTS terminal. However, applicant shows that it is well known in the art to use General Packet Radio System (GPRS) for mobile terminals (Present Specification, page 3 lines 13-14). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that these mobile devices can be of various network varieties such as GPRS, UMTS, or GSM. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to allow the mobile device access to the GPRS, UMTS, or GSM networks. One would have been motivated to do this in order to use an existing protocol instead of spending resources in order to develop one's own.
- Claims 43-45: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the computer program as in claim 29, but do not specifically disclose that the program is stored on a computer readable medium such as a removable memory card, or a magnetic or optical disk. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that a program by itself is just a series of words. In order for a program to

produce a result, it needs to be stored in a medium that is operable on by a computer or electronic device. These computer readable mediums include internal memory, external memory and optical and magnetic disks. One would be motivated to place the program on an external device such as optical or removal memory in order to allow a user to place the program on separate electronic devices, thereby expanding the usability of the program.

5. Claims 6-7, 20-21 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,674,453 (**Schilit et al.**) in view of "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 10 Minutes", by Jill T. Freeze, published by Sams Publishing 1999 (**Freeze**) and in further view of "Microsoft Windows XP Unleashed", by Terry W. Ogletree, published by Sams Publishing 2002 (**Ogletree**).

- Claims 6, 20 and 34: **Schilit et al. and Freeze** disclose the method as in claims 1, 15 and 29 above, but do not disclose that the first point is a stationary point on said view window. **Ogletree** shows the MouseKeys function in Microsoft WINDOWS XP™. The MouseKeys function allows a user to use keys to move the pointer on the screen (**Ogletree** pages 113-114). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to place the cursor in the stationary position of the view window, and use the arrow keys to navigate the window, pressing the "5" button to make a selection when the cursor falls on the right spot. One would have been motivated to do this in order for the method to appeal to a larger range of user, including those that prefer to use a keyboard or pad to a mouse or other pointing device. Schilit et al. further disclose the indicating of the nearest hyperlink (**Schilit et al.** Fig. 6A-C).

- Claims 7, 21 and 35: **Schilit et al., Freeze, and Ogletree** disclose the method as in claims 6, 20 and 35 above, but do not specifically disclose that the cursor is placed at the center of the view window. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that placing the key at a stationary point in the view window would mean that it could be placed at the center, bottom center, bottom left, top right, or any variation thereof the view window. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to place the cursor at the center of the view window. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide a more logical viewing experience for a user.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on May 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant alleges on page 1:

> In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-19, 22-33 and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schilit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,453) in view of "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 10 Minutes," by Jill T. Freeze (hereinafter Freeze). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim determining a link area comprising a pluralit7 of links nearest to a first point on said view window, in order to clarify that the "link area" includes multiple links. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 1 is amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim determining a link area comprising a plurality of links nearest to a first point on said view window, in order to clarify that the "link area" includes multiple links. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

However, as shown above in claim 1, Schilit and Freeze suggest the "link area", and Schilit further shows that an area may contain multiple links.

- Applicant alleges on pages 1-2:

> On page 3 of the Office Action the Office acknowledges that Schilit fails to disclose determining a link area nearest to a first point on the view window, and relies upon Freeze for this teaching. However, Freeze only discloses showing a URL for a link on which a pointer of a user's mouse has been placed over. Therefore, Freeze at most discloses determining when the user's mouse pointer is over a link, and it is not determined which link is closest, but instead only which link the pointer has been placed over. Freeze does not disclose or suggest determining which link is closest to the pointer, because no URL is displayed unless the pointer is directly over the link. Freeze does not teach or suggest that a URL may be displayed when the pointer is not directly over a link. Therefore, when the pointer is not over a link, no URL is displayed, i.e. no determination is made as to which link is closest to the point, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant alleges that Freeze fails to teach or suggest that a URL may be displayed when the pointer is not directly over a link, i.e. no determination is made as to which link is closest to the point, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As recited by the Applicant, Freeze discloses showing a URL for a link on which a pointer of a user's mouse has been placed over. A determination is made regarding which link (which takes up a space on the display, i.e. an area) the mouse pointer has bee placed over. This is done by determining which link area the pointer has been placed over, and therefore, other link areas which the pointer have not been placed on will not be selected, viz. the other link areas are further away from the pointer than the currently selected one. Therefore, Freeze does suggest that a determination is made as to which link area is closest to the point, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

- Applicant alleges on page 3:

> In order to further clarify the distinction between the present invention and the cited references, claim 1 is amended to recite that the link area comprises a plurality of links. Therefore, it is determined which link area, which is comprised of multiple links, is closest to the first point. In contrast to amended claim 1, Freeze only discloses determining when the pointer of a user's mouse is over a single link. One of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Freeze and Schilit, because the teachings of Freeze are limited to a single link.

> The purpose of moving the mouse pointer over the link is to display the URL so that the user knows where they are going before clicking on the link. See Freeze "Where am I going?" The mouse pointer must be directly over the link in order to show the user where the user is going, and therefore Freeze cannot provide any teaching or suggestion of determining the closest "link area comprised of a plurality of links" to the pointer, as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, the cited references alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended claim 1.

Applicant alleges that the amendment of claim 1 to read "a link area comprising a plurality of links" overcomes the prior art, specifically that Freeze cannot provide any teaching or suggestion of an area comprising a "plurality of links". The examiner agrees that Freeze does not provide the necessary disclosure for a link area comprising a plurality of links, but puts forth that, as shown above, Schilit does show an area containing multiple links.

- Applicant alleges on page 4:

> Furthermore, claim 6 recites that the first point is a stationary point on the view window, and the link area nearest to the stationary point is indicated visually on the display of the electronic device. On page 8 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Schilit and Freeze fail to disclose that the first point is a stationary point on the view window and relies upon Ogletree for this teaching. However, Ogletree also fails to disclose or suggest a stationary point, because contrary to the assertions of the Office, Ogletree does not disclose or suggest placing the cursor in a stationary position and navigating the window with the arrow keys. Instead, Ogletree teaches using the numeric keypad to move the mouse pointer, and therefore the mouse pointer is not stationary as recited in claim 6. For at least this additional reason, claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination. Claims 20 and 34 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 6, and therefore are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 6.

Applicant alleges that Ogletree does not show the first point being a stationary point on the view window. The examiner disagrees. As explained above, Ogletree shows that the mouse pointer, as used by Schilit and Freeze, can be navigated using the numeric keypad, i.e. 2 on the numeric keypad moves the mouse downward, the 6 key moves the mouse to the right. As explained by the examiner above, and exampled by Ogletree, in Windows XP, we can place the cursor in a stationary position using MouseKeys, and then move the view window using the arrow keys.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Tank whose telephone number is 571-270-1692. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (Alt. Fri Off) 0730-1500 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AT

ALT
August 13, 2007

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100